

## **REMARKS**

### **Formal Matters**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is amended herein to more clearly recite the invention. No new matter has been added.

### **Specification**

In the specification, the paragraphs beginning on page 15, line 21, and page 26, line 1 have been amended to make minor editorial corrections.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parasnis, U.S. Patent No. 6,728,753, in view of Baugher, U.S. Patent No. 5,644,715. This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

Applicant's invention solves the problem of recording information produced at a specific, pre-determined time and reproducing and displaying the same information on a plurality of screens at remote locations in synchronization with one another (page 1, lines 6-9). The claims recite a step of determining a first schedule data for recording said information, that is, determining a time at which information is to be recorded, and a step of delivering a second schedule data for reproducing the information at a time arbitrarily selected by a user. The recorded information is time-sensitive such that a first schedule data, or time for recording this information, must be determined and scheduled. In addition, so that the reproducing of the recorded information can be synchronized, a second time for viewing or reproducing it is needed. Thus the present invention has a first time at which the information is recorded, and a second time at which the information is viewed simultaneously by multiple viewers.

In contrast, Parasnis attempts to solve the problems that occur when viewing a presentation that is enabled through the use of either streaming format technology or downloaded files (column 2, lines 35-37, column 3, lines 25-27). The problem with both streaming and downloaded files, according to Parasnis, is that screen area occupied by the video image seen by the online audience is quite small (column 2, lines 58-59). To overcome this problem, Parasnis discloses downloading some data and streaming additional data so that “the live presentation includes a predefined content portion comprising a plurality of presentation slides that are displayed in response to slide triggering events during the live presentation, and a live portion comprising live audio and/or visual content performed in conjunction with the broadcast of the presentation slides” (column 4, lines 5-11). The predefined content portion of Parasnis is not time sensitive. Instead, Parasnis suggests that some content could be prepared and saved prior to the live presentation, but this content could be saved or recorded at any given time or even at more than one time. Parasnis does not disclose recording information in accordance with a schedule. The only scheduled data disclosed by Parasnis is the time at which the live presentation occurs; no second recording time is taught or suggested.

Further, the Examiner states that Parasnis does not explicitly indicate that the second schedule time should be received by the terminals at a time prior to the arbitrary time. Thus, Parasnis does not disclose or suggest determining or delivering a first schedule data for recording information, or recording information in accordance with the first schedule data, as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26, nor does he disclose or suggest that the second schedule time should be received prior to the arbitrary time.

The Examiner contends that Baugher teaches the second schedule time feature not disclosed by Parasnis. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Baugher discloses a data processing

system for scheduling and coordinating distributed, networked multimedia resources (column 2, lines 10-12, underline added). Baugher further discloses scheduling a session and setting and activating a time and date timer (column 5, lines 61-67, underline added). Thus only a time is disclosed. Because Baugher does not disclose or suggest recording information, he does not teach determining or delivering a first schedule data for recording information, or recording information in accordance with the first schedule data, as recited in the independent claims. In addition, Baugher teaches only one time and does not disclose or suggest “second schedule data delivered to said other terminal devices at a time *preceding said arbitrary time*”.

It has been held by the courts that to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See, *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). As illustrated above, neither Parasnis nor Baugher, taking singly or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26. The hypothetical combination of Parasnis and Baugher does not disclose or suggest both first schedule data for recording information, and second schedule data delivered to said other terminal devices at a time preceding said arbitrary time, as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26. Accordingly, these independent claims are patentable over the prior art. In addition, claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1, claims 7-10 depend from independent claim 6, claims 12-15 depend from independent claim 11, claims 17-20 depend from independent claim 16, claims 22-25 depend from independent claim 21, and claims 27-30 depend from independent claim 26, incorporating all of the features and limitations of their respective base claims, so that these dependent claims are patentable over the prior art. Accordingly, applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Katherine R. Vieyra  
Registration No. 47,155

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343 (telephone)  
(516) 742-4366 (facsimile)

KRV:kd